

Post-Hearing Response to Public Comments

In the Matter of the Proposed Amendments to the Rules Governing Unit and Program Approval, Minnesota Rules, chapter 8705; Proposed Repeal of Minnesota Rules, parts 8705.0200, subparts 2, 7, and 9; 8705.0300; 8705.1000; 8705.1100, subparts 1, 3, 4, and 5; 8705.1200; 8705.2200, subpart 4; 8705.2300; and 8705.2400

OAH Docket No. 8-9021-35856, Revisor's ID No. 04576

September 28, 2020

Introduction

In the fall of 2018, the Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board (PELSB or the Board) initiated a rulemaking to consider changes to the rules governing teacher preparation. On July 6, 2020, the Board communicated its intent to adopt rules after holding a public hearing.¹ On September 1, 2020, a public hearing was held on the proposed rules through WebEx (virtually). Members of the public testified during the hearing and submitted written comments both in support of and in opposition to the proposed rules. The post-hearing comment period ran from September 2, 2020 through September 21, 2020.

This document includes PELSB's response to issues, comments, and concerns regarding the proposed changes to the rules governing teacher preparation raised at the hearing on September 1, as well as during the post-hearing comment period. The post-hearing response focused on issues, comments, and concerns that addressed:

1. Whether PELSB has the authority to adopt rules;
2. Whether the legal and procedural requirements to promulgate rules were met; and
3. Whether the rules are needed and reasonable.

Many of the issues addressed at the hearing and during the post-comment period mirror those raised in the comments received pre-hearing, and so the Board's [pre-hearing response](#) to those comments is hyperlinked throughout.

¹ [Minnesota State Register, Volume 45, Number 1, page 5.](#)

Process concerns

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters expressed concerns that the public did not have adequate time to review revisions adopted by the Board on August 28, 2020.

Response

On July 6, 2020, PELSB published its Notice of Hearing, which triggered a comment period that ran from July 6, 2020, until 4:30 p.m. on August 10, 2020. In response to this comment period, the Board utilized time at multiple public board meetings to review comments and possible revisions, including on July 10 (regular board meeting), August 14 (regular board meeting), August 21 (special board meeting), and August 28 (special board meeting). For each of these meetings, comments and revisions were made publicly available. On August 28, 2020, the Board voted to adopt a number of revisions in direct response to public comments. Those revisions were submitted during the hearing as [Exhibit K-5](#) and addressed in PELSB's "[Pre-hearing response to Public Comments](#)".

After the Hearing was held, a comment period was opened for another twenty (20) days to allow for post-hearing comments, including any comments on the adopted revisions.

Definitions

Cultural responsive teaching.

Summary of comment(s)

Two commenters urged PELSB to replace the phrase and definition of "culturally responsive teaching" with "cultural competence" throughout the rule draft. "Cultural competence" is defined in Minn. Stat. 120B.30, subdivision 1 (q), as "the ability of families and educators to interact effectively with people of different cultures, native languages, and socioeconomic backgrounds." The commenters argued the definition of "culturally responsive teaching" is inconsistent with Minn. Stat. 120B.30.

Response

Please see PELSB's "[Pre-Hearing Response to Public Comments](#)."

Professional license.

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter expressed concerns that the proposed definition of "professional license" conflicts with Minn. R. 8710.0310, subpart 1 (K), which defines a "professional license from another state" as "a professional teaching license issued by the responsible state agency of another state and required by the law of that state for an individual to teach in a public school, but does not include an emergency, temporary, or substitute teaching license." The commenter argued that if this definition were found in another state's statute or rule, it would clearly include the Tier 1 and Tier 2 licenses issued by the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board, which is the responsible state agency, and meets the requirements of our state statutes for a teaching license issued by the state to teach in our public schools.

Response

The two definitions do not conflict. While Tier 1 and Tier 2 licenses are not labeled “emergency” or “temporary,” they have the properties aligned to these labels from other states. A Tier 1 license can only be issued if all licensed applicants are *unacceptable*,² showing that the district has an emergency to hire this applicant. Both Tier 1 and Tier 2 are temporary licenses as they are limited in their number of renewals by statute.

Unit standards

Designated school partnerships (Standards 6 – 8).

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters expressed concerns that the standards for designated school partnerships (Standards 6 – 8) are not needed and reasonable. One commenter expressed concern that the prescriptive nature of the requirements for the designated school partnerships, especially in regards to reviewing data analysis, is unreasonable. Another argued that the standards are overly burdensome for schools and districts. Further, several commenters noted that each unit is required to have an advisory committee that is tasked with providing feedback to the unit.

Response

PELSB believes that having a relationship with a school partner that goes beyond receiving broad, periodic feedback on candidate efficacy is needed to ensure that teacher preparation providers are meeting the needs of districts and students in how those teacher candidates are prepared. This belief comes from many years of discussions with district representatives working with teacher preparation candidates and providers. The proposed standards specific to the designated school partnership (Standards 6 – 8) addresses this need by raising the expectations of a partnership with at least one E-12 school. The proposed rule is reasonable because it balances this increased expectation while ensuring the workload for district and preparation providers is not overly burdensome. By requiring only one partnership at this level, a single district could have multiple partners by assigning a single school within the district to partner with a provider. Additionally, a preparation provider may have unlimited partnerships (as is current practice) to cover the variety of placements needed.

As a new rule, stakeholder concern has been raised throughout the comment periods. Changes have been made to address many of these concerns while maintaining the needed intent of the proposed rule. Some of the concerns raised seem to see this standard as applying to all partnerships, or to an entire district. Many preparation providers had already built strong school partnerships with quality feedback channels. This rule ensures that this expectation is met by all providers.

² Minn. Stat. 122A.181, subd. 3 (b) (1)) states “The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board must renew a Tier 1 license if: (1) the district or charter school requesting the renewal demonstrates that it has posted the teacher position but was unable to hire an *acceptable* teacher with a Tier 2, 3, or 4 license for the position.”

Service learning.

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters have urged the Board to require all teacher preparation programs in Minnesota to ensure their candidates:

1. Understand rationale for service learning;
2. Experience some form of service learning during their preparation; and
3. Learn how to apply service-learning to the specific group of students and specific subject(s) they are preparing to teach.

Response

Proposed Standard 2 contains the essential design components required for each program to be approved. Most of these design components/requirements are required by Minnesota statute.³

That said, the Board believes there are many program elements for new teachers that are necessary to build effective practice. Therefore, as part of the Board's [R-4615 rulemaking project](#), the Board is considering adding requirements to the "Standards of Effective Practice," which is set forth in Minn. R. 8710.2000, to ensure each teacher candidate is able to understand and apply service-learning to learning opportunities.

Cooperating teachers (Standard 10).

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters expressed concerns with the requirement that cooperating teachers "complete professional development in coaching strategies for adult learners." Specifically, the commenters urged the Board to consider "out-puts" rather than inputs. Additionally, there was concern that it was not clear "who" would be responsible for ensuring each cooperating teacher completed this professional development (i.e., the unit, the school district, etc.).

Response

The Board did not make changes to the requirement that cooperating teachers "complete professional development in coaching strategies for adult learners." The Board continues to argue that all teacher candidates need cooperating teachers that can provide effective feedback. These mentor teachers can be pivotal to a teacher candidate's student teaching success. Teacher preparation providers would have flexibility in monitoring the professional development in coaching strategies.

Access to information (Standard 18).

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter recommended the Board consider amending Standard 18 to read (recommended revisions in red):

³ Note: Two of the eight requirements set forth in proposed Standard 2 are not required by Minnesota statute but are key components to program design – instruction on the Code of Ethics and instruction on lesson planning.

Standard 18. The unit must make available to candidates, online ~~or~~ and in print, the following information...

Response

PELSB agrees that this information is “incredibly important information for a candidate to have as they navigate through their preparation program and work toward licensure.” PELSB did not propose requiring this information be available in both print and online in an effort to provide some flexibility to providers about the way they share information with their candidates.

Recruiting and retaining (Standard 16 and Standard 22).

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters recommended the Board clarify the proposed standards in order to ensure the standards do not establish a quota (recommended language in red):

Standard 16. The unit must implement effective strategies to recruit, retain, and increase the percentage of candidates who:

- (1) complete programs that address state and district teacher shortage areas; and
- (2) are of color or indigenous **at least** in proportion to **Minnesota’s** K-12 student demographic ratios.

Standard 22. The unit must implement effective strategies to recruit, retain, and increase the percentage of teacher educators who are of color or indigenous **at least** in proportion to **Minnesota’s** K-12 student demographic ratios.

Response

PELSB staff believe the following change is needed to clarify the intent of the requirement:

Standard 16. The unit must implement effective strategies to recruit, retain, and increase the percentage of candidates who:

- (1) complete programs that address state and district teacher shortage areas; and
- (2) are of color or indigenous **at least** in proportion to **either regional or state** K-12 student demographic ratios.

Standard 22. The unit must implement effective strategies to recruit, retain, and increase the percentage of teacher educators who are of color or indigenous **at least** in proportion to **either regional or state** K-12 student demographic ratios.

PELSB staff will present this proposed revision to the Board on October 8, 2020, for further consideration. If the Board adopts this revision, the Board will include this revision in its Order Adopting Rule.

Teacher educator qualifications (Standard 23 and Standard 24).

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters expressed concern that the Board did not use “non-traditional criteria” for teacher educator qualifications, including allowing instructors to hold a “baccalaureate degree only” as

required by Minn. Stat. 122A.2451. Additionally, the commenters argued that the current requirements listed in Standards 23 and 24 are an overreach and could prevent educators of color from becoming teacher educators.

Response

Proposed rule ensures that an individual with a baccalaureate degree is one option under each standard for teacher educator qualifications. While current rule (Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8 (A)) focuses on academic preparation, specifically for those who have completed a master's degree or higher, proposed rule considers academic preparation, including the attainment of a bachelor's degree, years of teaching experience, completion of a state-approved teacher preparation program, and for teacher educators of visual and performing arts or career and technical education, years of experience in the industry.

While there may be additional non-traditional qualifications, instead of attempting to list as many as possible in rule, proposed rule provides the pathway for providers to request a discretionary variance of this rule and allow the Board to review the alternate qualifications on a case-by-case basis.

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters expressed concern that many qualified teachers will be unable to serve as a teacher educator under this proposed rule change because they have not completed a state-approved teacher preparation program, such as teachers who obtained licensure through the portfolio process and those teachers who moved up the tiered licensure process.

Response

An individual, who has not completed a state-approved teacher preparation program, may still be qualified to serve as teacher educator under Standard 23(1) and Standard 23(3).

An individual, who has not completed a state-approved teacher preparation program, may still be qualified to serve as a methods instructor under Standard 24(1) and Standard 24(3).

All providers can seek a discretionary variance if and when they identify a teacher educator that does not meet these established qualifications, but the provider believes the teacher educator is qualified by other means.

Please see Appendix for a side by side of proposed Standards 23 and Standard 24 as set forth in Draft 7 and Draft 8.

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters argued that raising the required experience for a methods instructor from one year to three years (for those instructors with master's degrees) is unneeded and has the potential to do harm. Other commenters expressed support for the proposed increase in number of years of required teaching experience.

Response

Teacher preparation providers may use great flexibility in the qualifications of the teacher educator for the majority of the preparation program as defined in Standard 23. A methods instructor, Standard 24, must have a particular ability to guide teacher candidates in the strategies and application of these strategies as a teacher. The Board believes multiple years of teaching experience is needed before an individual can effectively train others in the methods of teaching the content.

While there may certainly be extensive alternate qualifications that could meet the same intent of multiple years of experience, instead of attempting to list as many as possible in rule, proposed rule

provides the pathway for providers to request a discretionary variance of this rule and allow the Board to review the alternate qualifications on a case-by-case basis.

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter urged the Board to consider a legacy clause for those teacher educators with only one year of teaching experience at the K-12 level. Another commenter argued that it is neither reasonable nor feasible to expect full-time faculty to go back to a K-12 classroom to gain additional teaching experience while also maintaining their academic roles. Adding that this will place financial strains on licensure programs across the state.

Response

While there may certainly be extensive alternate qualifications that could meet the same intent of multiple years of experience, instead of attempting to list as many as possible in rule, proposed rule provides the pathway for providers to request a discretionary variance of this rule and allow the Board to review the alternate qualifications on a case-by-case basis.

Rules specific to alternative preparation providers.

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter urged the Board must adopt a set of unique standards and requirements applicable to “alternative teacher preparation providers.”

Response

Since the authorization of alternative providers in Minnesota in 2011, there has been stakeholder concern about two divergent sets of standards for alternative versus traditional providers that lead to the perception that alternative preparation is less rigorous and less effective at preparing quality educators. The Board of Teaching standards for teacher preparation providers, were written prior to alternative pathway legislation and the standards and requirements were aligned to institutes of higher education (IHE). This rulemaking effort allows PELSB to combine the statutory requirements for all teacher preparation providers under 122A.092 with the statutory requirements under 122A.2451 into a single set of standards that ensure all preparation providers meet the same high standards but with flexibility and various options within the rule. Minn. Stat. 122A.2451 requirements closely model standards for traditional pathways with two notable exceptions.

First, the requirement that the provider need not be an institute of higher education nor partner with an IHE. Proposed rule ensures that the new unit standards do not align only to IHE requirements.

Second, Minn. Stat. 122A.2451 establishes the requirement that a teacher educator could only hold a baccalaureate degree. Proposed rule ensures that an individual with a baccalaureate degree is one option under each standard for teacher educator qualifications. (122A.2451 additionally requires nontraditional criteria be used for teacher educators and program approval. This is allowable under current and proposed rule for all providers.)

All other criteria required in Minn. Stat. 122A.2451 align with requirements for all providers. PELSB believes a single set of standards that meet all statutory requirements is **needed** to ensure no model of teacher preparation is treated as a less effective model and that the flexibility and options provided in proposed rule is a **reasonable** means to maintain diverse models of preparation in Minnesota, including

nontraditional program models within traditional providers and conventional program models within alternative providers.

Unit and Program Approval

Initial Approval.

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters expressed concern with the proposed length of time it would take a provider to obtain initial unit approval.

Response

Please see PELSB's ["Pre-Hearing Response to Public Comments."](#)

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter expressed concerns that the rule has limited who can apply to become a unit to "a Minnesota institute of higher education, school district, charter school, or nonprofit corporation under chapter 317A" and that this was in conflict with Minnesota Statutes.

Response

PELSB based which entities are eligible to apply for unit approval on:

Minn. Stat. 122A.2451, subd. 3. A school district, charter school, or nonprofit corporation organized under chapter 317A for an education-related purpose is eligible to participate under this section. An eligible entity may apply for provider and program approval simultaneously.

Minn. R. 8705.0100. Licenses to teach in Minnesota may be granted to persons who complete approved programs leading to teacher licensure in Minnesota institutions approved by the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board to prepare persons for teacher licensure according to this chapter. The teacher preparation institution or provider must meet the standards under parts 8705.1000 and 8705.1100 or the procedures and requirements established under part 8705.1200 prior to being authorized to submit specific licensure programs for program approval under parts 8705.2000 to 8705.2600.

Interim reports when all standards are not met.

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter recommended that all units be required to submit interim reports to demonstrate compliance with unmet standards – regardless of their approval status (recommended changes in red).

The board ~~may~~ **must** require the unit to submit an interim report during the approval period to demonstrate compliance with standards identified as "Met as Planned" and "Not Met" in the review team's written report.

Response

The Board may grant initial unit approval for a duration of two years. Many standards that are identified as "met as planned" may need those two years to implement and show evidence of implementation.

While some “met as planned” and “not met” standards could or should be addressed before the end of those two years, the Board should maintain discretion in when an interim report is required.

Unit Report on Continuous Improvement.

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter expressed concerns about the requirements of the Unit Report on Continuous Improvement, including

- What are the applicable board actions based on the contents of the report?
- Why is there no peer review component?
- How frequently is this report required?

Response

Proposed rule removes many unit-led continuous improvement standards from program-specific efficacy evaluation, known as the “program narrative” under current rule. Instead, the Board proposes a unit-wide response to program efficacy in a report issued midway between unit site visits (the Unit Report on Continuous Improvement).

The Unit Report on Continuous Improvement is needed to monitor ongoing continuous improvement work by the provider, but does not instigate board action. Peer review is not needed for general monitoring. However, the Board is able to take action on a unit or program’s status at any time if compliance to standards and harm to candidates is of concern. Often, a unit’s approval includes an interim report that may also connect to the Unit Report on Continuous Improvement. This could lead to action on the unit’s status.

The intent of the submission of this report was every three years, midway between the six-year unit review cycle. To ensure consistency with this intent and to reduce confusion, PELSB staff will recommend changes to the Board that if approved, will be included in the Order to Adopt Rule.

Program Review.

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter urged the Board to amend the following language (recommended revisions in red):

The unit leader must provide input to board staff regarding the review team membership. If agreement is not reached, or if input is not provided, the ~~board staff~~ unit leader shall appoint the review team members.

Response

While providers play a valuable role in identifying individuals who could have conflicts of interest and therefore should not be a member of the review team for an upcoming site visit, unit leaders do not have access to all of the information needed to put together strong teams. When Board staff assemble teams, staff are mindful to balance the teams with a variety of factors including experience reviewing, preparation provider type (ex. private/public, small/large, faith-based/secular, online/traditional, IHE based/alternative), geographic region, and other factors. Reviewer availability also plays a role in the final team makeup.

Program Review Panel (PRP).

Summary of comment(s)

Several commenters urged the Board to reconsider the makeup of the Program Review Panel (PRP), specifically recommending the rule language not call out specific organizations.

Response

Please see PELSB's ["Pre-Hearing Response to Public Comments."](#)

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter expressed concern that by listing organizations as part of the PRP membership, the rule excludes other potential organizations from joining and adding meaningful value, insight, and support to the panel.

Response

While the proposed rule explicitly names the Minnesota Association for Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE) and Education Minnesota as organizations to be included in the PRP, proposed rule also states that membership must not be limited to these two organization.

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter expressed concern that the inclusion of the Minnesota Association for Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE) and Education Minnesota on the PRP is a conflict of interest to the Legislature's goal of creating non-traditional and new pathways to the teaching profession.

Response

Current and proposed rule contain clear language that members of the PRP will recuse themselves from current or former units and programs, as well as other perceived conflicts of interest.

Additionally, the Board has intentionally sought to remove any bias against alternative and non-conventional programs from proposed rule. Existing rule (Minn. R. 8705.2000) requires all new alternative and non-conventional programs to be reviewed by the PRP. Proposed rule eliminates this requirement. If an alternative or non-conventional program are found to have met all applicable standards and there are no requests for comments, the program will be recommended to the full board for approval (and will bypass the PRP).

Summary of comment(s)

One commenter expressed concerns that specifying organizations in rule is unprecedented and/or unlawful.

Response

There are many places in both rule and statute where this is already the case. If the Board were to adopt no changes to 8705.2000, the PRP would include PELSB, MACTE, the Minnesota Department of Education, and Education Minnesota.

Conclusion

This document constitutes the Board's response to comments and testimony heard at the hearing on September 1, 2020, and to comments submitted during the post-hearing comment period that ran from September 2, 2020 through September 21, 2020.

The Board has presented information to demonstrate that the Board has the legal authority to adopt rules, that all procedural requirements have been met, and that the proposed changes to the rules governing teacher preparation are needed and reasonable. That information is in the Statement of Need and Reasonableness (SONAR), exhibits submitted into the record at the hearing and posted to PELSB's rulemaking webpage, in PELSB's pre-hearing response, and in this document (PELSB's post-hearing response).

If you have questions about the Board's response, please contact Michelle Hersh Vaught at Michelle.Vaught@state.mn.us.

Appendix: Side-by-side of proposed Standard 23 and Standard 24 as set forth in Draft 7 and Draft 8

Draft 7	Unofficial Draft 8 (includes revisions adopted by the Board on August 28, 2020)
<p>Standard 23. The unit must ensure each teacher educator is able to show expertise for teaching assignments and one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) a master's degree or higher in any field and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) at least 18 graduate credits in the teacher educator's area of instruction; or (b) dissertation or published research in the teacher educator's area of instruction; (2) a bachelor's degree and at least five years of experience as a teacher of record with a professional license and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) national board certification; or (b) participation in at least 125 hours of instructional leadership activities, such as serving as a cooperating teacher of candidates during student teaching or practicum, facilitating professional development for other teachers, mentoring teachers, or peer coaching; or (3) for teacher educators of career and technical education or the visual or performing arts, a bachelor's degree in any field and at least five years of relevant professional work experience aligned to the teacher educator's area of instruction. 	<p>Standard 23. The unit must ensure each teacher educator is able to show expertise for teaching assignments through documentation of one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the individual holds a master's degree or higher in any field and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) at least 18 graduate credits in the teacher educator's area of instruction; or (b) has completed a dissertation or published peer-reviewed research in the teacher educator's area of instruction; (2) the individual: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) holds a bachelor's degree in any field; (b) has at least five years of experience as a teacher of record; and (c) has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program. <p>At least one of the components listed in paragraphs (a) through (c) must align to the content area of instruction; or</p> (3) for teacher educators of career and technical education or the visual or performing arts, a bachelor's degree in any field and at least five years of relevant professional work experience aligned to the teacher educator's area of instruction.
<p>Standard 24. The unit must ensure each teacher educator of field-specific methods instruction, including reading methods, is able to show expertise for teaching assignments and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) is qualified as a teacher educator under Standard 23, subitem (1), and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program; (b) has three years of experience as a teacher of record; and (c) holds or held a professional license aligned to the scope and content area of instruction; (2) is qualified as a teacher educator under Standard 23, subitem (2), and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program; 	<p>Standard 24. The unit must ensure each teacher educator of field-specific methods instruction, including reading methods, is able to show expertise for teaching assignments through documentation of one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the individual: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) holds a master's degree or higher in any field and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. has at least 18 graduate credits aligned to the content area of instruction; ii. has completed a dissertation or published peer-reviewed research in the teacher educator's area of instruction; or iii. has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program aligned to the content area of instruction; and

Draft 7	Unofficial Draft 8 (includes revisions adopted by the Board on August 28, 2020)
<p>(b) has seven years of experience as a teacher of record; and</p> <p>(c) holds or held a professional license aligned to the scope and content area of instruction; or</p> <p>(3) is qualified as a teacher educator under Standard 23, subitem (3), and:</p> <p>(a) has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program;</p> <p>(b) has five years of experience as a teacher of record; and</p> <p>(c) holds or held a professional license aligned to the scope and content area of instruction.</p>	<p>(b) has three years of experience as a teacher of record, including at least one year aligned to the scope and content area of instruction;</p> <p>(2) the individual:</p> <p>(a) holds a bachelor's degree in any field;</p> <p>(b) has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program; and</p> <p>(c) has seven years of experience as a teacher of record, including at least three years aligned to the scope and content area of instruction.</p> <p>At least one of the components listed in paragraphs (a) and (b) must align to the content area of instruction; or</p> <p>(3) for teacher educators of field-specific methods in career and technical education or the visual and performing arts, the individual:</p> <p>(a) holds a bachelor's degree in any field and:</p> <p>i. the bachelor's degree is aligned to the content area of instruction;</p> <p>ii. the individual has at least five years of relevant professional work experience aligned to the teacher educator's content area of instruction; or</p> <p>iii. the individual has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program aligned to the content area of instruction; and</p> <p>(b) has seven years of experience as a teacher of record, including at least three aligned to the scope and content area of instruction.</p>